Meeting of the Decommissioning Project Community Workgroup (#24)
Tuesday, July 19, 2005
Huron Public Library

The meeting began at 7 p.m. Present were Workgroup members Janet Bohne, Chris Gasteier, Anne Hinton, Montez McDuffie, Bill Ommert, Ralph Roshong and Bob Speers, along with the following NASA representatives: Tim Polich, Decommissioning Project Manager; Keith Peecook, Senior Project Engineer; Peter Kolb, Project Environmental Manager, and Sally Harrington, Public Affairs Specialist, NASA Glenn. Also present were Sheryl Leeper, Resident Manager of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and Susan Santos and Michael Morgan of FOCUS GROUP. There were 15 members of the public in attendance including NASA retirees Len Homyak, Jack Ross, Jim Martz and Ruth Hasse.

Tim Polich provided welcoming remarks and introduced the meeting participants. Susan Santos spoke next, reviewing the agenda and asking for and receiving acceptance of the minutes from the April meeting. She then introduced Keith Peecook, who provided a Project Update.

Project Update

Keith reported on a number of project activities that had taken place since the April Workgroup meeting. He reported that fixed equipment removal (FER), has been completed in the Hot Retention Area, a concrete vault located 90% underground and adjacent to the Waste Handling Building at the rear of the Reactor Facility. Keith said the workers had segmented and removed eight steel tanks in the HRA, each of which could hold up to 60,000 gallons of water that had high levels of radiation from reactor operations. The water was held in these tanks until the radiation levels had decayed sufficiently to allow the water to be released or reused and the tanks were drained when the Reactor Facility was shut down in 1973. He said that in removing the tanks and other fixed equipment in the HRA, workers had packaged more than 500,000 pounds of low-level radioactive waste (LLRW), most of which has been shipped to the Envirocare licensed disposal facility in Utah, where the remaining waste from the HRA will be shipped shortly.

Keith also briefly discussed upcoming FER from the Cold Retention Area, consisting of two tanks, which together, once could hold one million gallons of water contaminated from reactor operations, until the radiation in the water had sufficiently decayed to allow for that water's safe release. These tanks were also drained when the reactor was shut down. He said that NASA would drain groundwater that had accumulated in the CRA, remove rubber liners from the bottom of the tanks, then characterize the concrete in the CRA to determine how much concrete will have to be removed, packaged and shipped as LLRW and how much can remain in place. Keith said he expected all FER to be complete by the end of August.

Soil Remediation Activity

Keith next discussed the ongoing remediation of soils which been contaminated from contact with water used in reactor operations. He reported that in May, soil removal work began in May in the Emergency Retention Basin (ERB). The ERB is an outdoor holding area, which had a capacity of five million gallons. It was used on a few rare occasions when the reactor was operational, at times when the amount of water contaminated from reactor operations had exceeded the capacity of the HRA and the CRA. The ERB is 300 feet long and 200 feet wide, with a 15-foot high bank surrounding it. When NASA surveyed the area for radiation last fall, Keith explained that the truck-mounted Geoprobe, used for taking samples more than 20 feet deep, had determined that contamination in the ERB was spread over a wide area but was not deep in the soil. He added that workers, wearing protective Tyvex suits and hardhats, are using

small excavation vehicles, known as Bobcats, to remove contaminated soil "three to six inches at a time" and move the soil into strong fabric bags – each of which is numbered. He noted that the bags are rated to hold up to 15,000 pounds but that NASA is only filling bags to a capacity of 5,000 pounds, then moving four bags at a time into special fabric bag known as a "Super Sacks," which he explained are classified by the U.S. Department of Transportation as "strong, tight containers." He also noted that the level of radiation is so low that the trucks carrying the soil do not require a radioactive materials placard on them and that the drivers do not need to wear protective gear.

Keith said there is continuous monitoring conducted in the ERB, to ensure that the remaining soil is not above one-half of the NASA-established cleanup levels known as Derived Concentration Guidelines (DCGL). If radiation in the soil measures more than half of the DCGL, NASA excavates and packages the soil. Keith explained that the reason NASA removes soil to below the DCGL is because, when ORISE, an independent contractor for the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), comes in to confirm cleanup levels, this contractor "could swing a meter and come up with a level higher than our measurements, maybe even higher than the DCGL." He said that in such a situation, the NRC could require NASA to remobilize its soil remediation team to do more work, pointing out that this has occurred on some other decommissioning projects. Thus, NASA is being cautious by ensuring that soil is removed to levels below the DCGL.

Keith showed several slides of soil removal activity and said the Super Sacks are being loaded onto trucks for transport to a nearby rail facility in Willard (located in Huron County). In keeping with NASA's commitment to openness and candor, he talked about a minor incident that took place on June 30 in Willard and involved soil transportation. He said that since 2001, NASA has routinely provided advance LLRW shipment information to public safety authorities in Erie County, including County Emergency Management Agency (EMA) Director – and Workgroup member – Bill Walker. But he said shipments traveling to Willard were so recent that NASA had initially "committed an oversight" in not providing the same notice to public safety officials in Huron County. On June 30, some workers in an industrial plant near the Willard rail yard heard about shipments of "radioactive soil" but did not have information on the extremely low radiation levels, thus raising some questions. Keith added that this information had not been initially communicated to Huron EMA Director (and fellow Workgroup member) Bill Ommert. But Keith pointed out that Walker and Ommert work together closely, such that NASA was in touch with Ommert later that day; and in the days that followed, NASA held a meeting with Huron County officials (adding them to the shipment distribution list) and also meeting with plant management. He added that the issue had been resolved to the satisfaction of all the Huron County officials and plant workers and Keith thanked Bill Ommert for helping to facilitate the meetings that cleared up the issue. Huron County public safety officials have also been added to NASA's distribution list to receive the quarterly newsletter and other project officials and had been invited to the Workgroup meeting.

In addition to the ERB, soil removal is also being conducted in what Keith described as Area 1A, which is located south of the Pentolite Ditch, and is inside the Plum Brook Station fence line. When the Reactor Facility was operational, the ditch was a normal pathway for water from the reactor to travel through until it reached Plum Brook. Like the ERB, the contamination in Area 1A is not deep in the soil but is spread over a wide area. He said the ditch has been drained to facilitate its cleanup, especially on the Pentolite's banks where excavation, packaging and monitoring will also take place. Keith estimated that soil remediation in both areas should be complete by the end of August. To date, NASA has shipped 4.1 million pounds of soil and packaged another 1.9 million pounds for subsequent shipment. Keith said that before the cleanup

is completed, NASA anticipates excavating, packaging and shipping and additional 1.4 million pounds, resulting in an average of three truck shipments per day through the end of August.

Core Samples

Keith then reported briefly on, and showed slides of, core samples of concrete being taken from several areas of the Reactor Facility, including the bioshield (which once provided a layer a protection around the former reactor tank) as well as samples from the quadrants and canals of the Containment Vessel. NASA has taken 21 samples, all three inches in diameter and as much as 32 inches long. He said the samples "give us a rough look at the concrete," which he said had been laid out in several layers when the Reactor Facility was built. The sampling in the bioshield is being done to determine the level of activation in the metal rebar it contains and also to "better determine how much of the concrete must be removed and the best way to do that," since clean concrete more than three feet below grade can remain in place. Any concrete that must be removed will be shipped to Envirocare as LLRW. Keith noted that when the Reactor Facility was constructed, concrete in the quadrants and canals had been coated with an epoxy, which had served to do "a good job of keeping contamination out." But he said the epoxy contained asbestos, which NASA will have to remove. He added that NASA had recently sent the core samples to an independent, off-site laboratory for analysis and that project personnel were now in the process of evaluating the results, "to determine the proper decontamination actions to take."

Evaluation of Embedded Piping and Concrete Decontamination Options

Keith then gave an update on work done to determine the best approaches for decontaminating piping embedded in concrete more than three feet below grade. He said that at the end of last February, "We were at a break point in the project. We removed 98% of the source term radiation" in the Reactor Facility. But he pointed out that the other two percent – which must be removed in order to meet NRC mandated cleanup levels – is in the soil, concrete and embedded piping throughout the facility, which makes removing this remaining radiation difficult. He said (as had been discussed at the April Workgroup meeting), that the discovery of "more challenging conditions than anticipated …raised questions about the best way to complete decommissioning."

Since March, a team consisting of personnel from project contractor MWH Constructors, as well as NASA retirees, an outside consultant and NASA and USACE personnel (representing a variety of expertise and backgrounds, including waste disposal, hydrogeology, demolition, structural and pipe cleaning) has been considering several approaches based on the cost and practicality of the work. They had discussed several options and considered several decontamination techniques, including mechanical (which Keith described as employing "a big Roto Rooter brush"), vacuuming and power washing.

Keith said that several factors had to be evaluated, noting that cleaning the pipes and leaving them in place can cost as much as $200 per foot, with the possibility that some pipes might have to be cleaned more than once in order to reach the required cleanup levels. On the other hand, he observed, cutting out some of the piping could compromise the structural integrity of some buildings and cause a safety hazard, and that while demolishing the buildings and removing the pipes with the other debris would save on time and decontamination costs, it would dramatically increase the costs of LLRW packaging, shipping and disposal.

The team considered four options. Option 1 was closest to the original plan, emphasizing decontamination by various techniques, then leaving the piping and concrete in the buildings in place until it had been certified as clean, and subsequently demolishing the buildings to three feet below grade and using the clean concrete as fill. This approach would minimize the removal and

shipment of piping and concrete as LLRW. Keith said Option 2 was termed "rip and ship," since it involved removing the concrete to three feet below grade and shipping it to Envirocare, then decontaminating the piping located three feet or more below grade. Keith noted that this option "fell out" of the analysis early on because of risk and technical issues associated with the possible compromising of the structural integrity of some buildings, which could put worker safety at risk. Option 3 involved a "rip and ship approach" that maximized waste removal (concrete and piping) and minimized the amount of decontamination that would take place. He observed that while this approach would lessen the amount of time that would otherwise be spend on decontamination, it would dramatically raise project disposal costs, since NASA is currently paying Envirocare 72 cents a pound for the waste materials. Keith noted that this rate compared favorably with other decommissioning projects, but that the total tonnage of material that might require disposal is what drives up the costs.

Option 4 involved a combination of options 1 and 3, with decisions on the proper approach to be determined on a building-by-building basis. In some buildings, decontamination will be emphasized while in others, removal of the materials will be stressed. Keith reported that the team decided to recommend Option 4 to NASA, but only after consulting with personnel from a number of other decommissioning projects that were "a year or two ahead of us." He pointed out that the combination approach was called for because "you don't rip and ship a clean building." Keith added that NASA "generally concurred" with the team's recommendation on Option 4 and had made a similar recommendation to NASA senior management He also said the goal will be to work toward "effective waste minimization" to reach project cleanup levels.

Embedded Piping Proof of Process

According to Keith, one of the factors involved in recommending options for embedded piping was "proving that our decontamination techniques would be effective." He discussed what he termed "proof of process" to determine the best decontamination techniques to employ. Workers cleaned nine runs of pipes at varying lengths and with diameters ranging from four to ten inches. In all, they cleaned 475 feet of pipe using a variety of techniques. He said the crew needed to find pipes with "nice sweeping turns," while noting that many the pipes – despite floor plans to contrary – had actually been connected at 90 degree angles (in floor drains in the quadrants and canals) thus making them "hard to run a (cleaning) brush through" when taking a mechanical approach to decontamination. In addition to the latter approach, NASA used a high-powered vacuum and a high-pressure (at 20,000 pounds per square inch) power washer known as a hydrolaze. He reported that work was performed on pipes ranging in contamination levels from very light to highly contaminated and in essentially good condition, to extremely corroded, noting that some pipes had silt and water in them.

Keith said that overall, the proof of process news was good, reporting that 90% of the contamination was able to be removed, using a combination of mechanical (the "Rotor Rooter" brush and vacuuming techniques). He added that before the proof of process decontamination work began, the most heavily contaminated piping had 38 million dpm and contained sludge and water. After being cleaned, the levels in the pipe measured 6,000 dpm, substantially below the pipe's DCGL (cleanup standard) of 50,000 dpm. Workgroup member Janet Bohne asked about the levels of radiation from water found in the pipes. Keith said the levels were very low and that the water had been collected by NASA, which worked with subcontractor Duratek to have the latter remove the radioactive water in a tanker truck shipment to a Duratek disposal facility in Tennessee. A member of the public asked if NASA personnel accompanied the waste shipments to the disposal facility. Keith said they did not, but pointed out that NASA has a contract with Envirocare to supply licensed carriers to safely ship the waste.

Workgroup member Chris Gasteier asked Keith if, after the pipe had been decontaminated, there had been any degeneration of the metal in the pipe. Keith said there had not been any and observed that the pipe cleaning had involved the use of the powerful hydrolaze, without incurring any damage. He did note that the proof of process testing indicated that NASA should use another type of detector to measure radiation in the piping, because the model used during proof of process cleaning was too delicate, and that NASA would amend its Final Status Survey Plan to make sure the new detector was employed. "The bottom line," Keith concluded, " Is that there's nothing we cannot clean on the (project) site," adding that in many cases, only "one pass" with a mechanical or vacuum means was necessary to achieve the pipe cleanup while "at worst," just three "partial" passes were required to clean the pipe.

Project Path Forward

After Keith discussed proof of process, Tim Polich provided a look at the project's path forward, with an emphasis on cost and schedule considerations. He noted that the (Embedded Piping) Evaluation Team's recommendations would result in much higher disposal and other project costs, and that the team "had not been constrained by existing funding limits," as is the Decommissioning Project budget for 2006 and 2007. He added that, based on his budget for these years, "our project costs would not allow us to finish (decommissioning) on schedule," by the end of 2007. He noted that, as had been discussed at previous Workgroup meetings, there have been other project delays and resulting cost increases, such as the need to better protect workers (through the use of more articulated tooling) during segmentation activity, and the subsequent schedule delays, and the need to orchestrate asbestos removal with the final stages of segmentation activity, had taken "a good portion of our contingency funds." He added that "Given these realities, NASA is determining the best way to proceed," with decommissioning and was committed to meeting project cleanup levels, but that NASA had sent a letter to the NRC, indicating that it would need until the end of 2010 to complete decommissioning.

Tim said that during the near term, using the existing budgeted funds, NASA will continue with a number of planned activities. These include completing fixed equipment removal (FER) in the Cold Retention Area and soil remediation in the Emergency Retention Basin and in Area 1A, adding that after this work was complete this fall, contractor MWH Constructors would then demobilize. According to Tim, "We now have a different project," than the one which involved the removal of 98% of the radioactive inventory in the Reactor Facility at the start of decommissioning. He noted that NASA must still complete the removal of the remaining radiation from buildings (mostly in concrete walls and floors), embedded piping and soils, observing, "When we stopped (decontamination work) in February, it did not make sense to clean piping and concrete if we were going to tear down the buildings." He said 2006 will see a focus on "eliminating risks and unknowns." As part of this effort, NASA will use smaller crews (6-8 workers) than those which have been utilized to date.

NASA will also use a small crew to complete FER in Hot Cells 1, 2 and 3 in the Hot Lab, adjacent to the Containment Vessel. When the reactor was operational, the Hot Cells were used to analyze materials that had been exposed to radiation and Cells 1, 2 and 3 are he most heavily contaminated of these Hot Lab chambers. These activities, he pointed out, will result in the elimination of more than 99% of the original "source term" radiation in the Reactor Facility. In addition, NASA will continue to conduct characterization in targeted areas of the facility. Tim said this work would be conducted "with a much reduced project staff, and within existing funding," during 2006 while utilizing a smaller project management team. Then, in 2007, NASA

will "integrate data on risk reduction and prepare a very complete," Request for Proposals to finish decommissioning.

Tim added that NASA expected, by 2007, to obtain the funding necessary to finish the project and would develop a detailed timeline to reach license termination. "We have a firm commitment from our management and NASA to continue funding the project," Tim noted, "But it takes two years to get into the budget cycle." He said NASA would likely award a contract late in 2007 to finish the project and reiterated that NASA's commitment remains to "finish the job safely, to protect the public, the workers and the environment, and to achieve the unrestricted release of the existing NRC licenses."

NASA retiree Jim Martz asked if the changes meant the project was "going on hiatus," for two years, with Tim responding, "Yes and no." He pointed out that a project in Saxton, PA managed by the GPU utility, had continued on a limited basis (removing contaminated soil), and that there had been an even slower approach to completing the decommissioning of the former Fermi power reactor in Michigan. He said that in February, NASA had "let 60 people go," at Plum Brook, with Keith adding that "a year ago, we had well over a hundred people working inside the (Reactor Facility) fence," but that in 2006, this number would be closer to 20, with even fewer people working in 2007. Then, he said, "we'll have a bigger contract" to take on more of the work in 2008.

Workgroup member Janet Bohne observed that at previous meetings "The numbers said NASA was on time and on budget," but Tim noted that since then, "We've had the risk management issues," while Keith remarked that "Risk translates into higher costs… The Evaluation Team put some truth in our projections." Susan Santos of FOCUS GROUP added that, in fact, previous reports given at Workgroup meetings were showing project costs increasing as compared to the overall available budget, and that the projected schedule is "constrained by available funding. If we had all the funding, we could get all the work done, but now there's only so much shifting (of work) that you can do." Keith noted that one project cost change involved the soil remediation, observing, "We had a baseline of 8 million pounds (to remove). We'll eventually have another 8 million pounds, when we get the funding in 2008." NASA retiree Len Homyak asked about the total cost estimate through 2007, with Tim responding that NASA had a budgeted amount of $152 million but "we will use that up by the end of 2007." Len the asked how much money the Decommissioning Team would be requesting to complete the project. Tim said he did not yet know, but noted that disposal costs, at 72 cents a pound (while "some projects pay more than a dollar a pound") would be a major factor in the amount of funding requested.

Workgroup member Chris Gasteier asked if NASA were confident about getting the additional funding "out of Congress" but Tim said he expected the project would actually obtain the funding from NASA's own budget, observing that "Headquarters has already put a placeholder in our 2008 budget," adding that he needed to come up, next March, with a hard figure for completing the project. Workgroup member Ralph Roshong asked what NASA would be left with, at the end of the new decommissioning completion date of 2010 and Tim responded "27 acres of green fields," with Ralph remarking, "At an investment of $175 or $200 million." Keith pointed out that "The alternative was to keep the (NRC) license and monitor the facility while the radiation took hundreds of years to decay," while Susan Santos added that the decision to decommission was a mandate from the NRC. Keith also said that one building – the ATS (Advanced Test Services) Building – formerly part of the Reactor Facility, has been recycled, such that it is now being used as a high-technology incubator, the result of NASA working with the office of Congresswoman Marcy Kaptur (D-Toledo). Chris Gasteier asked to what depth the former Reactor Facility site would be prairie, with Keith responding that below three feet, there would

likely be concrete used as fill. He added that the area was also wetlands, noting that "in 20 or 30 years, this area will be a second-growth forest."

A member of the public asked if there had been any Reactor Facility soil toxicity due to the (non-radioactive) contamination at the old Ordnance Facility, which was located on what is now Plum Brook Station land. Pete Kolb, the Decommissioning Project's Environmental Manager, said there had not been any, but that there were "red water ponds" west of the Reactor Facility. Keith added that groundwater sampling within the 27-acre facility had no detected any contamination. NASA retiree Jack Ross asked how the Decommissioning Project budget would be affected by the current NASA Glenn fiscal "climate of cut, cut, cut." Tim said the overall NASA budget was "still pretty firm," explaining that decommissioning represented a very small part of the agency's overall budget of $14-15 billion, adding that the project gets funding from NASA's Environmental Program, which has what he termed, "No Year Funding," money that did not have to be spent in any particular fiscal year. Tim added that the fact that the project "has a commitment to another agency – the NRC," means the Decommissioning Project has the leverage to ensure we have the funds." He also said "The advocacy is high and there is regulatory pressure to complete this project."

Community Relations Update

NASA Glenn Public Affairs Specialist Sally Harrington provided a brief Community Relations Update. She reported that the July edition of the project's quarterly newsletter had been sent to 2,300 recipients and several Workgroup members said they had received their copies. She also said that the annual Community Information Session (CIS) would be held on the evening of Tuesday, October 18 at the Cedar Point Center at BGSU Firelands, adding that the Decommissioning Project would also hold a Media Briefing at the Reactor Facility on the morning of the CIS. Susan Santos noted that the next Workgroup meeting would take place at 5:30 p.m., just before the CIS and that NASA would again be asking Workgroup members to stay for the CIS to serve as greeters and in other capacities, adding "we'll send you flyers and we'll be asking you for advice on the best ways to advertise the CIS."

Plum Brook Ordnance Works Cleanup

Workgroup member Janet Bohne followed with an update on the cleanup of contaminated land at the World War II era Ordnance Works (the old TNT factory), located on what is now Plum Brook Station land. As NASA has done on the Decommissioning Project Website and Information Line, Janet pointed out that the Ordnance Works cleanup is not a NASA project, but is managed and funded by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. She said, however, that she and her husband Mark, and John Blakeman – all Decommissioning Community Workgroup members – are members of similar panel, the Restoration Advisory Board, with Mark serving as its Community Co-Chair.

Janet distributed a print presentation and talked briefly about the history of the Plum Brook Ordnance Works (PBOW), which operated from 1941 to 1945. During this period, the U.S. Army contracted with the Trojan Powder Company to manufacture trinitrotoluene (TNT), dinitrotoluene (DNT) and pentolite at the Plum Brook Ordnance Works, producing more than one million pounds of ordnance. She said that when the facility closed and was decommissioned late in 1945, most of the 9010-acre facility was "just burned to the ground" and decontamination activity took place before it was turned over to the U.S. Army Ordnance Department and subsequently to the War Assets Administration. In 1994, the PBOW was determined to be

eligible for the Defense Environmental Restoration Program for Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS). The RAB was formed when cleanup work began in 1996.

Janet outlined a number of contaminated areas in the PBOW, including: Acid Areas; Ash Pits and Power Plants; Burn Grounds; Garage and Maintenance Areas; the Pentolie Area; the Rail Ca Unloading/Satellite Area; Red Water Ponds; Site-wide Groundwater; TNT Areas (A,B,C); TNT Rail Car Loading Areas; Toluene Tank Areas; Underwater Wastewater flumes, Waste Lagoons, and Wastewater Treatment Plants. She then proceeded to provide a brief lesson in what she termed "kitchen science" in order to describe the cleanup process being used in areas throughout the PBOW site, a process known as Windrow Composting. She noted that much of the contamination in the ground occurred as the result of interaction between the toluene in the TNT and the hydrogen in water and said the formation of what she termed "Bucky Balls" (named for architect Buckminster Fuller) served to use carbon to basically trap the hydrogen and toluene.

While Janet explained the process, she put together a cookie mixture of alfalfa, sugar, butter and flour, noting the similarities of the chemicals in the soil and in the mix. She pointed out that carbohydrates are a combination of carbon, hydrogen and oxygen and observed that the sugar in the mix "breaks down into carbon." She also pointed to other similarities in the mix and the composting treatment, comparing flour in the mix to wood chips in the compost and butter to the chicken manure used in the compost. She explained that "benzene helps to form the chemical reaction," in the "Bucky Ball" formation. Janet added that "toluene is a form of benzene," and "because the soil has benzene in it," the toluene-turned-benzene "gets locked inside the Bucky Ball," adding that "a great big piece of composting equipment mixes the (soil) ingredients and covers them."

According to Janet, the process takes 40 days and treats about 20 square feet of the time, and she observed that the cleanup will take considerably longer to finish than the Decommissioning Project's new completion date of 2010. Chris Gasteier asked if one pass with the machine was sufficient for the cleanup and Janet said it generally takes two. Susan Santos asked if there were any leachibility and Janet responded there was not, because the compost "becomes really god soil…(The USACE) cooked it to get the carbon to lock up the toluene and benzene." Workgroup member Bill Ommert asked about other contaminants in the soil, with Janet noting that there was DDT in the soil from the days when it was farmland (before the Army took over the land in World War II) as well as oil that once spread on area roads. Bill then asked if there were any chemical processes in the soil that might release the toluene in the "Bucky Balls" but Janet said the balls were "like diamonds." When Bill responded that diamonds could be set on fie, Janet said "You would have to go down ten feet" to reach the composted toluene.

Janet said the composting technology represents a real advancement, adding that the Ordnance RAB has an annual federal Technical Assistance Grant of $25,000, which she said can enable the RB to write other grants through the nation's science community, funding she would like to see used to further promote the study of soil cleanup efforts. Chris Gasteier asked how many PBOW sites were affected, with Janet responding "hundreds and hundreds of acres," adding that after the areas are cleaned up, the project will plant prairie grass "like crazy" and she referenced the expertise of fellow RAB and Workgroup member John Blakeman on this subject.

Topics for Next Meeting

Susan Santos briefly mentioned topics for the next Workgroup meeting, which will take place on Tuesday, October 18 at 5:30 p.m., just before the Community Information Session. She said there would be a short presentation on environmental sampling results and noted that NASA had made copies of sampling reports – covering 2002 to 2004 – available for pickup by Workgroup

members at this evening's meeting, with several members taking copies. She also said there would be a Project Update.

The meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.